

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Seventy-Second Psalm

WILLIAM G. SEIPLE
NORTH JAPAN COLLEGE, SENDAI, JAPAN

THE Seventy-second Psalm is generally considered Messianic. Jewish interpretation, as reflected in the Peshiṭta, the Targum, the Talmud and the Midrashim,[1] and the mediaeval commentators Rashi (1040-1105), Ibn Ezra (1092-1167) and Ḳimḥi (1105-1170), referred it to the Messiah, while early Christian exegesis, as we learn from the Vulgate and Church Fathers like St. Jerome[2] and Theodoret, found in it, in one way or another, an allusion to the Christ. Mediaeval commentators, like Calvin and Melanchthon, and more recent commentators, like J. D. Michaelis, E. W. Hengstenberg, Franz Delitzsch, Briggs[3] and others regard it as *typically* Messianic, referring it historically to Solomon or some other reigning king but in a spiritual sense to the Messiah or the Christ. But in the *Critical Notes on the Books of Kings* (*SBOT*), p. 227, l. 36 f., Professor Paul Haupt considers this psalm a poem celebrating the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285 B. C.). The *King* spoken of in the first verse is Ptolemy Lagi, the "second Nebuchadnezzar"; and the *King's son*, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the "second Cyrus".[4]

[1] Cf. B. Pick, "Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied by the Ancient Synagogue" *Hebraica* (= *AJSL*), 2, 134-5.—For the abbreviations see this JOURNAL, vol. 29, p. 112, and the references quoted there.

[2] Cf. H. B. Swete, "St. Jerome on the Psalms", *Expositor*, June 1895, pp. 425-6.

[3] Cf. E. W. Hengstenberg, *Commentar über die Psalmen*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1851), p. 270, and C. A. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy* (1886), pp. 137-8.

[4] Cf. also *JHUC*, No. 163, p. 54a below and p. 69, n. ∓.

A number of other scholars also refer this psalm to the same period. As early as 1831, Hitzig in his *Begriff der Kritik*, p. 108, referred this psalm to Ptolemy Philadelphus. Olshausen[5] thought that verse 10 referred to one of the Ptolemies but could not agree with Hitzig, as he questioned whether such an identification of the "oppressed" with the people of God, as we have in v. 2, was justifiable as early as the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Reuss[6] assigned the psalm to the time of the early Macedonian rulers, before the Maccabean uprising, i. e., to the period of the Ptolemies. Cheyne in 1891 referred the psalm to Ptolemy Philadelphus and thought it "was most probably composed in Jerusalem before the release of the Jewish captives—not long after the accession of Philadelphus in his father's lifetime, B.C. 285.[7] Wellhausen thinks the king mentioned in the psalm is an Egyptian and consequently assigns it to the period of the Ptolemies.[8] Smend concludes from verses 8-10, where the limits and extent of the king's dominion are mentioned, that the description suits one of the Ptolemies.[9]

Various other views have been proposed. Because of the superscription, the great mediaeval Jewish commentators, Rashi, Ibn Ezra and David Ḳimḥi, regarded David as the author of this psalm and the king referred to in it as Solomon. The great Reformer, John Calvin, considered it the last prayer of David for his son Solomon, who probably put it into poetic form. Venema (1762), Keil, Hengstenberg, and Professor Franz Delitzsch assigned the authorship of the psalm to Solomon. The superscription of our psalm, however, cannot be taken as furnishing any genuine historical evidence of its author or date.[10]

[5] Cf. J. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Leipzig, 1853), p. 305.

[6] Cf. E. Reuss, *Geschichte d. Heiligen Schriften d. A. T.* (2nd ed., Braunschweig, 1890), p. 558.

[7] Cf. T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* (Bampton Lectures of 1889), London, 1891, p. 144.

[8] Cf. J. Wellhausen, *The Book of Psalms* (*SBOT*, English), New York, 1898, p. 193.

[9] Cf. R. Smend, *Lehrbuch d. Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (2nd ed., Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 376, footnote 2.

[10] The great Syrian theologian and Biblical scholar, Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, more than 1500 years ago, could not regard the super-

Although the title ascribes the authorship to Solomon, he is neither the writer nor the subject of the psalm. It has been ascribed to Solomon, on account of a certain general resemblance of the picture of imperial sway which the psalm presents with that of Solomon's empire in 1 Kings 3-10.[11] The phrases "the king" and "the son of the king" are taken to refer to David and Solomon respectively. The gift of righteous judgment for which request is made in v. 1 is supposed to refer to the wisdom and justice of Solomon. Verses 7 and 8 are supposed to describe his peaceful and extended rule, while v. 10 is taken to be an allusion to the visit of the Queen of Sheba (cf. 1 Kings 10 1 ff.).

Ewald assigned this psalm to the times of Josiah (640-608 B.C.) or even later.[12] Graetz was inclined to refer it to Hezekiah on his accession to the throne (720 B.C.). In this he was followed by Halévy, whereas Dillmann assigned it to the period following Isaiah's activity (740-701 B.C.).[13] Briggs (*Psalms,* 1907) makes it a prayer composed for the occasion of Josiah's accession to the throne. Driver in his *Introduction* (8th ed., 1898), p. 385, makes it pre-exilic but the latest of the royal psalms (2, 18, 20, 21, 28, 45, 61, 63, 72).

Toy and G. Buchanan Gray both consider the psalm post-exilic, the former placing it between the years B.C. 500 and 300, and the latter making it "a product of the period after the Exile but before the Maccabees and not later than the end of the

scriptions of the Psalms, either in the Hebrew or the LXX, as original and authoritative, a view that is now generally recognized. Cf. T. K. Cheyne, "Early Criticism of the Psalter in Connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia", *Thinker* (June, 1893), pp. 496-8, and F. Baethgen, "Siebzehn makkabäische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia", *ZAT,* 1886, pp. 261-288; 1887, pp. 1-60.

[11] Jewish tradition regards Solomon as the author also of Ps. 127, Prov., Cant., Eccles., and the apocryphal books of the Wisdom of Solomon and The Psalms of Solomon, cf. C. H. Toy's *Proverbs* (1899), pp. xix-xx.

[12] Cf. H. Ewald, *Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1840).

[13] Cf. J. Halévy, *Revue Sémitique,* 1896, pp. 333-6, and A. Dillmann, *Handbuch d. alttestamentlichen Theologie* (edited by R. Kittel), Leipzig, 1895, p. 528.

fourth century".[14] W. Robertson Smith referred the psalm to the Persian period, "the last days of the Achaemenian empire", during the civil wars under Artaxerxes III Ochus (B.C. 361-336).[15] G. Beer thinks it may be post-exilic and perhaps refer to one of the great kings of Persia.[16] Baethgen, who, following Giesebrecht, omits vv. 8-11 as a later insertion, makes the rest of the psalm an ode belonging to the later period and commemorating the accession of an Israelite king to the throne, but thinks it cannot be determined to which king it refers.[17]

Others put the date of our psalm as late as the Maccabean period. Professor Church in Church and Seeley's *The Hammer*, p. 370, seems inclined to apply it to Judas Maccabaeus. Duhm[18] refers the psalm, with the exception of vv. 5-11, which he considers a later insertion, to a native Israelite king after the Exile, and thinks it was composed under the Hasmonean kings for ritual purposes, perhaps in the time of Aristobulus I (104-3 B.C.) or his brother Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.). S. Weissmann, in the *Jüdisches Literaturblatt*, May 13, 1886, sees an allusion to the Jewish name of Hyrcanus II, who was high priest from 79-40 B.C., in the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον יגון v. 17.

The language of v. 2, where the entire Jewish nation are spoken of as "oppressed" (עניים) precludes a Solomonic date for our psalm, as such a condition of affairs does not harmonize with the ideal picture of the wisdom and justice of Solomon's reign. There can be no reference here to a pre-exilic king, either of Israel or Judah, as the conditions set forth in the psalm distinctly presuppose the post-exilic period, when the Jews felt the burden of foreign domination with all its attendant ills. The language, too, of the rest of the psalm bears the stamp of a late date. Cf. the parallel in v. 8 to Zech. 9 10 (late Maccabean, so

[14] Cf. C. H. Toy, *JBL*, 7, 53 and 18, 162; and G. Buchanan Gray, *JQR*, 7, 679.

[15] Cf. *OTJC* (1895), p. 221, and article "Psalms", *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed. (1885), 20, 31a.

[16] Cf. G. Beer, *Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen* (Marburg, 1894), p. 59f.

[17] Cf. F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1897), p. 218.

[18] Cf. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 189.

Prof. Haupt) and the allusion in v. 17b to Gen. 22 18 and 26 4 (640 B.C.).

With the settlement of the question of post-exilic date, there arises another question, viz., whether the king here mentioned is a native Israelite or a foreigner. Reuss[19] thinks there is no mention of a later Jewish king, "for to which of them could the greatest flatterer promise the tribute of Arabia and Ethiopia, of the isles and western possessions?"

The expression "Thy people" in v. 2 seems to be a clear reference to a foreign king. The king appears distinct from the people of God. Wellhausen, in a note on the phrase "Thy people" in the English translation of the Psalms (*SBOT*, p. 193) remarks: "Not: *his* people. They do not look upon themselves as belonging to the monarch for whom they pray. They are a spiritual, non-political people (*Thy* people = Thy pious ones), taking no part in the kingdom and its government". Baethgen admits that the wishes and hopes expressed in vv. 8-11 are so great that we can hardly understand them, if they are referred to an Israelite king, particularly one who lived in a time of oppression, but thinks it improbable that the patriarchal promises of Gen. 22 18 and 26 4, to which allusion is made in v. 17b, should be applied by a pious Israelite to a foreign king.[20]

In v. 15, constant prayer is made for the sovereign. Passages like Ezra 6 9 and 7 23 show us that the post-exilic Jewish community prayed for their sovereigns. Accordingly v. 15b of our psalm finds a striking parallel in Baruch 1 11, where prayer is made for the heathen kings Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar: *καὶ προσεύξασθε περὶ τῆς ζωῆς* Ναβουχοδονοσὸρ *βασιλέως* Βαβυλῶνος *καὶ εἰς ζωὴν* Βαλτασὰρ *υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*. Cheyne, in commenting on Ps. 72 15 in his *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, p. 154, n. *i*, says: "An occasional special prayer for a Jewish sovereign can be understood, but scarcely that constant repetition of prayer and blessing (Ps. lxxii. 15), except for a foreign ruler of whom much spiritual good might be hoped, but little as yet could be known".

From v. 8, where The River, i. e., the Euphrates, is mentioned

[19] Cf. above, n. 6.

[20] Cf. above, n. 17.

as one of the boundaries of the king's realm, we conclude that there is no reference here to any of the Chaldean, Persian, or Seleucid kings, as, for all of these kings, the Euphrates was an inland stream. From the extent of the king's sway as given in v. 10, an Egyptian king seems to be meant. According to Hitzig, it is neither Inarus, Nectanebus, nor any of the Egyptian kings who tried to throw off the Persian yoke.[21] Wellhausen considers Pharaoh Necho (610-595 B.C.) out of the question. Only the Ptolemies (323-31 B.C.), then, remain for consideration; and because of the extent of the king's dominion in v. 10, one of the first three Ptolemies must be referred to. The phrase "the son of the king" v. 1 cannot refer to Ptolemy Lagi, who was not the son of a king. If we refer the psalm to Ptolemy III Euergetes, we cannot explain the terms of praise in v. 14 f. Accordingly, only Ptolemy II Philadelphus is left.[22]

Our psalm was perhaps presented and recited in Greek at Alexandria by an Alexandrian Jew in 285 B.C., when Ptolemy Lagi appointed his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, as co-regent, just as Ps. 45 was perhaps presented in Greek by the high-priest Jonathan at the wedding of King Alexander Balas of Syria with the Egyptian princess Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy VI Philometor, at Ptolemais in 150 B.C.[23] Hebrew translations of these two poems may have been later inserted and preserved in the Psalter. The expression מעשי "my poem" Ps. 45 2 seems to be a translation of the Greek ποίημα and to point to this.[24]

Our psalm was perhaps written as an expression of the Jewish hopes which Ptolemy's reputation warranted. Ptolemy I Soter, at the age of eighty-two, had abdicated in favor of his younger son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and died two years later (283 B.C.). An allusion to this event may be seen in the expression *the king's son* v. 1. According to Professor Haupt, the phrase

[21] Cf. F. Hitzig, *Die Psalmen* (Leipzig und Heidelberg, 1863), p. 114.

[22] Cheyne assigns also Ps. 45 to Ptolemy Philadelphus, on the occasion of his marriage with Arsinoe, the daughter of Lysimachus, king of Thrace, cf. his *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, p. 170 f.

[23] Cf. Paul Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 22. n. 7 = *AJSL*, 18, 212.

[24] Cf. Paul Haupt, "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm", *AJSL*, 19, 136, n. 11, end.

משפטיך למלך־תן *Bestow on the King Thy justice* at the beginning of our psalm has the double meaning of *Endow the King with Thy justice* and *Punish (give it to) him for all he has done to us.*[25]

Punishment is desired for the aged king, Ptolemy I Soter, who, in 312 B.C., took advantage of the Sabbath law to attack and capture Jerusalem, when the Jews were unarmed, and subsequently adopted rigorous measures and carried away very many Jews as prisoners of war to Egypt (cf. Jos. *c. Ap.* I. 22 and *id.*, *Ant.* XII. 1 and Schürer *GJV* [1909], 3, 34).

According to Josephus (*Ant.* XII. 1), Ptolemy Philadelphus ransomed with his own money 120,000 Palestinian Jews who had been made prisoners of war by his father and sold into slavery, spending for this purpose more than 460 talents (=$496,800) and paying for each captive 120 drachmas (=$21.60). In the pseudepigraphical Letter of Aristeas,[26] §§ 15-27 and particularly § 37, the number of captives is "more than a hundred thousand" and the price for each twenty drachmas. Thus he "delivered the crying needy" (v. 12) and "redeemed their lives from oppression" (v. 14a), for "their blood was precious in his sight" (v. 14b). Our psalm was probably composed after the news of the release of the captives came to Jerusalem. Josephus tells us (*Ant.* XII. 5) that the high-priest Eleazar, in his reply to the king's letter, says that from feelings or heartfelt gratitude sacrifices were offered for Ptolemy and his family immediately on receipt of the news, and that the people prayed for the king and the prosperity of his kingdom. Cf. v. 15 and Letter of Aristeas, § 45: "We therefore straightway offered sacrifices on thy behalf and on behalf of thy sister and thy children and thy 'friends', and the whole people prayed that thy undertakings

[25] On similar equivocal phrases in Semitic, cf. "Critical Notes on Kings" *SBOT*, p. 227, l. 31; p. 216, l. 17; and Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 43, n. 30; p. 48, n. 36; and p. 52, n. 4.

[26] For translations, cf. German by Paul Wendland in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen u. Pseudepigraphen d. A. T.* (Tübingen, 1900) 2, 1-31 and English by H. St. J. Thackeray, *JQR*, 15, 337-391. For text, cf. Paul Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula* (B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, 1900) and H. B. Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (1900), pp. 499-574.

might ever prosper, and that Almighty God would preserve thy kingdom in peace with honor, and that the transcription of the holy law might be to thy profit and carefully executed".

In v. 8 the king's dominion is to extend "from sea to sea", i. e., from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, and "from The River to the ends of the earth", i. e., from the Euphrates to the Pillars of Hercules, or Strait of Gibraltar. The description by the poet Theocritus of the conquests of Ptolemy Philadelphus (Idyl XVII 86-92) reminds us very strongly of vv. 8-11 of our psalm:

καὶ μὴν Φοινίκας ἀποτέμνεται Ἀρραβίας τε
καὶ Συρίας Λιβύας τε κελαινῶν τ' Αἰθιοπήων.
Παμφύλοισί τε· πᾶσι καὶ αἰχμηταῖς Κιλίκεσσι
σαμαίνει, Λυκίοις τε φιλοπτολέμοισί τε Καρσί,
καὶ νάσοις Κυκλάδεσσιν, ἐπεί οἱ νῆες ἄρισται
πόντον ἐπιπλώοντι, Θάλασσα, δὲ πᾶσα καὶ αἶα
καὶ ποταμοὶ κελάδοντες ἀνάσσονται Πτολεμαίῳ.

"Yea, and he taketh him a portion of Phoenicia, and of Arabia, and of Syria; and of Libya, and the black Aethiopians. And he is lord of all the Pamphylians, and the Cilician warriors, and the Lycians, and the Carians, that joy in battle, and lord of the isles of the Cyclades—since his are the best of ships that sail over the deep—, yea all the sea, and land and the sounding rivers are ruled by Ptolemy".[27]

Polybius tells us that the empire of the first Ptolemy included Egypt, the coast of the Red Sea to Berenike and the Elephant Coast, Cyrene, Palestine, Phoenicia, Cyprus, Rhodes, the "free" cities of the coast of Asia Minor, and the islands of the Aegean Sea. For a century, the Ptolemies controlled the Cyclades and the adjoining coasts, together with Palestine and Coele-Syria.

Ptolemy II received from his father Egypt, the adjacent parts of Arabia and Libya, Cyrene, Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Cyprus. By conquest, he extended his rule over the Aegean Sea with its coast cities and islands and also over Caria, Pam-

[27] Cf. Andrew Lang's translation of *Theocritus, Bion and Moschus* (Golden Treasury Series), London, 1901, p. 95.

phylia, Cilicia, and Lycia. At one time during his reign, Egyptian garrisons were stationed even as far as the Euphrates.[28]

We may be quite certain that the tribute from the conquered countries flowed into his coffers, cf. v. 10. Of this we have a striking confirmation in Theocritus, Idyl XVII, l. 95 f.:

> ὄλβῳ μὲν πάντάς κε καταβρίθοι βασιλῆας·
> τόσσον ἐπ' ἄμαρ ἕκαστον ἐς ἀφνεὸν ἔρχεται οἶκον
> πάντοθε.

"And in weight of wealth he surpasses all kings; such treasure comes day by day from every side to his rich palace." He was indeed the wealthiest ruler of his time. Appian tells us in his *Prooemium*, chapter 10, that, according to the royal archives (ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἀναγραφῶν), Ptolemy II, at the end of his reign, had an army of 200,000 infantry, 40,000 cavalry, 300 elephants, 2,000 war-chariots, weapons for 300,000 men, 2,000 minor war-vessels and 1,500 men-of-war, including quinqueremes, and the material for double this number, 800 sloops with gilded beaks and sterns, the enormous sum of 740,000 Egyptian talents in his treasury, and an annual income of 14,800 talents and 1,500,000 measures of grain.

The early Ptolemies made special efforts to attract trade and commerce with India, Arabia, and Ethiopia to Egypt. To this end, several cities were built on the Red Sea, the Arab pirates routed, and Pharaoh Necho's canal made once more navigable.[29] Mahaffy in his *Story of Alexander's Empire* (New York, 1892), p. 121 f., gives us the following picture of the commercial life of Alexandria, this great center of Hellenism and Semitism, at this time: "It was the great mart where the wealth of Europe and of Asia changed hands. Alexander had opened the sea-way by exploring the coasts of Media and Persia. Caravans from the head of the Persian Gulf, and ships on the Red Sea, brought all the wonders of Ceylon and China, as well as of Farther India, to Alexandria. There, too, the wealth of Spain and Gaul,

[28] Cf. J. P. Mahaffy, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1899), pp. 42, 54, 68.

[29] Cf. J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (2nd ed., Gotha, 1877), 3, 52-55.

the produce of Italy and Macedonia, the amber of the Baltic and the salt fish of Pontus, the silver of Spain and the copper of Cyprus, the timber of Macedonia and Crete, the pottery and oil of Greece—a thousand imports from all the Mediterranean—came to be exchanged for the spices of Arabia, the splendid birds and embroideries of India and Ceylon, the gold and ivory of Africa, the antelopes, the apes, the leopards, the elephants of tropical climes. Hence the enormous wealth of the Lagidae, for in addition to the marvellous fertility and great population —it is said to have been seven millions—of Egypt, they made all the profits of this enormous carrying trade."

Ptolemy II explored Ethiopia and the southern parts of Africa and brought back for his zoological gardens specimens of curious fauna. Pliny in his *Natural History* (VI, 29: *qui Troglodyticen primus excussit*) is authority for the statement that Ptolemy II was the first to explore the coast of the Troglodytes, the cave-dwellers of Ethiopia.

Ptolemy II was a diplomat rather than a warrior. He never took the field in person, but gained his victories by political combinations and bribes from his enormous wealth. He had his emissaries and supporters everywhere. Besides this, he enjoyed the support and friendship of many kings (cf. v. 11). In 273 B.C., after the defeat of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, by the Romans, he sent a friendly embassy to them. His ambassadors were received with great enthusiasm and accorded every distinction, for he was then the most powerful monarch in the world.

The late date of our psalm, the fact that the king mentioned therein is king of the Jews but a foreigner, who is favorable to them, and the extent of his kingdom—all unite in confirming our conviction that the psalm must refer to Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Both the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kings granted religious freedom and certain political rights to the Jews.[30] Particularly

[30] See E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes* (1902), III, 20, 65 f.,' 87, and article "Alexandria" in *Jewish Encyclopaedia* I, pp. 361-8, J. P. Mahaffy, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1899), pp. 32-79; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides* (Paris, 1903) I, 50 f., 223; and articles on "Ptolemy" and "Ptolemy II" in *EB* and Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

in Egypt, the Jews played a prominent rôle in public life. The early Ptolemies were, in the main, favorably disposed toward them, and under some of the later Ptolemies, Jews attained to high positions of trust.

Shortly after the founding of Alexandria, Alexander the Great is said to have induced many Jewish colonists to come there by granting to them the right of citizenship, and even to have established Jewish settlements in Upper Egypt. Mahaffy thinks this hardly probable. At any rate, Ptolemy I Soter carried off great numbers of Jews as captives to Egypt. His lenient policy toward the captives, however, induced many of their co-religionists to come and settle there. During his reign, not less than 30,000 Jewish soldiers were stationed in garrisons throughout the land. Cf. Letter of Aristeas, § 13: "Of which number he armed about thirty thousand picked men and settled them in the fortresses in the country".

No other Ptolemy, however, in fact, no other king, carried his kindness toward the Jews so far as Ptolemy II Philadelphus. He figures in Jewish tradition as the liberator of all the Jewish captives in his realm (Jos. *Ant.* XII. 2) and the patron of the Temple, to which he sent a number of costly presents (Jos. *Ant.* XII. 4). It may have been part of the diplomacy of Ptolemy II to make friends with the Jews in order to win and hold at least the southern part of Syria. Probably because of the growing numbers and importance of the Jewish population in Egypt, he is said to have authorized a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. This version is known as the Septuagint from a tradition recorded in the Letter of Aristeas that it was a translation made all at once by seventy or, more exactly, seventy-two officially appointed translators. The tradition runs as follows.[31]

In the early years of the reign of King Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the librarian Demetrius Phalereus, who was in charge of the famous Alexandrian Library, suggested to the king that he should have prepared for the Library a Greek translation of the Jewish law-books. For this purpose, Ptolemy sent to Palestine

[31] Cf. also Bar Ebhraya's *Chronicles*, Paris edition, p. 37, and Roediger's *Chrestom. Syriaca*, p. 13 (No. IV).

for translators. Seventy-two men,[32] six from each of the twelve tribes, were sent to Alexandria by the high-priest Eleazar of Jerusalem and put by twos in thirty-six cells on the island of Pharos. They are said to have completed their task in seventy days to the entire satisfaction of the king and his librarian, and to have been sent back to Palestine with expensive gifts and high acknowledgment of their services.

This story is no longer regarded as historical[33] in all its details, but is undoubtedly so far correct, that at least the Pentateuch was translated during the reign of Ptolemy II and possibly under royal patronage. A. Bouché-Leclercq, however, in his work, *Histoire des Lagides* (Paris, 1903), I, p. 223, thinks that the Septuagint version was not made by the orders of Ptolemy II, nor in his time, nor for the Library, but that it was the voluntary effort of Alexandrian Jews, who were working for the large number of their co-religionists who did not know Hebrew.

Ptolemy III Euergetes is said to have offered sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem. On an inscription found in Lower Egypt and given by Schürer *GJV*, 3, 66, n. 27, Ptolemy III is represented as granting the right of asylum to a proseuche, or oratory. Some of the synagogues also seem to have enjoyed the same right. This is of interest as showing that the Jewish houses of worship were placed on an equality with the heathen temples.

Ptolemy VI Philometor showed his kindness toward the Jews in permitting them to build a temple at Leontopolis. According to Josephus (*c. Ap.*, II. 5), Ptolemy VI and his consort Cleopatra "entrusted their whole kingdom to Jews, and the commanders-in-chief of the army were the two Jews Onias and Dositheus". Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy VI, in a war against her son, Ptolemy Lathyrus, appointed two Jews, Helkias and Ananias, sons of the high-priest Onias, who built the temple

[32] Note the curious coincidence between the number of translators and the number of our psalm in the Psalter.

[33] The Letter of Aristeas, from internal evidence and its tendency to laud the Jews, shows that it is not contemporary with the events it narrates but is the work of an Alexandrian Jew, writing about 200 B. C. (so Schürer). Wendland, Willrich and Thackeray put it even later. See literature cited in n. 26.

at Leontopolis, as generals in her army (cf. Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 10 and 13).

Under the earlier Ptolemies, the Jews formed so large a portion of the population of Alexandria that a separate section of the city, east of the palace, was assigned to them. Of the five districts, into which the city was divided, two were known as Jewish districts, because inhabited mostly by Jews. Josephus tells us (*B. J.*, II. 18, 8) that the fourth, or "delta", district was populated by the Jews. Although even at this time the Jews were isolated, this isolation was not strictly enforced, for synagogues and Jewish dwellings could be found all over the city. The Alexandrian Jew enjoyed a greater measure of political independence than his co-religionist elsewhere. In Alexandria the Jews formed an independent political community, ruled by an ethnarch. Here they occupied a more influential position in public life than anywhere else in the ancient world. They held public offices and positions of honor, and by their riches and education constituted a large and influential portion of society. So great was their wealth that they were able to make frequent pilgrimages to Jerusalem and send many rich gifts to the Temple.[34]

Neither Olshausen nor Hupfeld found any regular stanzas in our psalm. Hengstenberg divided it into two stanzas: I a, vv. 1-5; I b, vv. 6-10; and II a, vv. 11-15; and II b, vv. 16-17. De Wette arranged it in five stanzas, vv. 1-4, 5-7, 8-11, 12-14, and 15-17. Delitzsch also has the same number, but a different grouping of the verses: vv. 1-4, 5-8, 9-11, 12-15, and 16-17 (so Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, London, 1888). Ewald divided the psalm into three stanzas, vv. 1-7, 8-15, and 16-17[35] (so also A. B. Davidson, *Biblical and Literary Essays*, London, 1902, p. 161). W. E. Barton (*The Psalms and Their Story*, Boston, 1898, Vol. I, p. 175) has five stanzas, viz., vv. 1-5, 6-8, 9-11, 12-14, and 15-17. The arrangement by Zenner-Wiesmann (*Psalmen*, Münster i/W,

[34] Cf. Hugo Willrich, *Judaica*, Göttingen; Schürer's review in *TLZ* (1900), p. 587; Wilcken, *Griech. Ostraka aus Ägypten u. Nubien* (Leipzig, 1899); *TLZ* (1901), p. 65; and Max L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (Berlin, 1897), esp. chapter 1: *Mitherrschaft u. Sammtherrschaft.*

[35] Cf. H. Ewald, *Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes* (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1840), part 2, p. 114.

1906-7) is as follows: I a, vv. 1, 2, 3; I b, vv. 4, 6, 5; II, vv. 7, 8, 10, 9, 11; III a, vv. 12, 13, 14, 15; and III b, vv. 16 and 17.

Bickell makes the meter heptasyllabic throughout but cannot discern any arrangement in stanzas.[36] Briggs in his *Messianic Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1886), p. 138, footnote, considers the psalm a hexameter with occasional pentameters and tetrameters, and divides it into three strophes,[37] or stanzas, omitting v. 12 as an interpolation. In his *Psalms* (1907) he arranges the psalm in two stanzas, vv. 1-7 and 13-17a, each of seven hexameters, and omits vv. 8-12 and 17b as a series of glosses, consisting of citations or adaptations of earlier writings, added in Greek or Maccabean times "to give the psalm a Messianic meaning and to adapt it for public worship". Duhm[38] divides the psalm into nine stanzas, containing each four poetic stichs, or rather hemistichs, with three beats to each hemistich. Vv. 10 and 15a he omits as glosses. Baethgen (*Die Psalmen*, 3rd ed., Göttingen, 1904) makes the prevailing meter double trimeter (*Doppeldreier*, i. e., 3 + 3 beats), vv. 3, 5, and 17c hexameters (*Sechser*, i. e., three dipodies), and v. 10 two pentameters (*Fünfer*, i. e., 3 + 2 beats). According to Cheyne (1904) the poem consists of trimeters, i. e., hemistichs of three beats each.

According to Professor Haupt's arrangement of the text, our psalm consists of three stanzas, each of two couplets with 3 + 3 beats in each line. Verses 4, 12, 13, 7, 3, and 17a should be omitted as glosses and וידכא עושק v. 4 and לעם v. 3 as tertiary glosses. V. 3 may have originally stood in the margin as a gloss to v. 16 but a copyist may have taken it as a gloss to v. 2 and put it immediately after it. Originally vv. 6 and 8 may have been grouped together, as both begin with ירד. Verses 12 and 13 are simply a continuation of the gloss v. 4. The doxology, vv. 18-19, and the colophon, v. 20, form no part of the original poem and are not in metrical form.

[36] Cf. G. Bickell, "Die Hebräische Metrik", *ZDMG*, 34, 557, and 35, 421, and *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, part 3 (Innsbruck, 1883), p. 131.

[37] According to Professor Haupt, the term *strophe* should be used only of quantitative, not of Hebrew accentual, poetry, cf. his article on "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm", *AJSL*, 19, 132, n. 4.

[38] Cf. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen erklärt* (Freiburg i/B., 1899), p. 187, and *Die Psalmen übersetzt* (Freiburg i/B., 1899), pp. 106-8.

The Hebrew text should be arranged as follows:

עב

A	1 i	"יהוה" משפטיך למלך־תן	וצדקתך לבן־מלך:
	2	ידין עמך בצדק	ועניך ישפט במשפט:
	14 ii	מחתך יגאל נפשם	ויקר דמם בעיניו:
	15	ויתפללו בעדו תמיד	וכל היום יברכוהו:
B	6 iii	ירד כמטר על־גז	כרביב מזרף ארץ:
	16	יהיה פשת־בר בארץ	ירעש כלבנון פריו:
	17 iv	ויציצו מעיר כעשב	ויתברכו־בו כל הגוים:
	5	יאריך שמו עם־שמש	ועם־ירח לדור דורים:
C	8 v	וירד מים עד־ים	ומנהר עד־אפסי ארץ:
	9	לפניו יכרעו צרים	ואויביו עפר ילחכו:
	10 vi	מלכי תרשיש ואיים {}	ושבא אשכר יקריבו {}:
	11	וישתחוו־לו כל מלכים	וכל גוים יעבדוהו:

(α) 1 לשלמה
(β) 4 ישפט עניי עם יושיע לבני אביון
(γ) 12 כי־יציל אביון משוע ועני ואין עזר־לו:
13 יחס על־דל ואביון ונפשות אביונים יושיע:
(δ) 14 ומחמס
(ε) 15 ויחיו ויתנו־לו מזהב שבא
(ζ) 7 יפרח ביומיו צדיק ורב־שלום עד־בלי ירח:
(η) 16 בראש הרים
(θ) 3 ישאו הרים שלום
(ι) 16 הארץ
(κ) 17 יאשרהו
(λ) 17 {לפני־שמש ינין שמו} יהי שמו לעולם {}
(μ) 10 מלכי
(ν) וסבא
(ξ) מנחה ישיבו
(ο) 4 וירכא עושק
(π) 3 לעם

This may be translated as follows:

Psalm 72

A i 1 [α]Give the king Thy justice, O Jahveh,
and Thy righteousness unto the king's son!
2 He will govern Thy people with righteousness
and rule Thine oppressed with justice.[β]
ii 14 [γ]He will redeem their lives from oppression,[δ]
in his sight their blood will be precious.[ε]
15 They will ever pray for him
and bless him all the day.

B iii 6 He will descend like rain on the mown meads,
like a shower that waters the land.
16 [ζ]In the land there will be a rich harvest,
[η]its crop will wave like Lebanon.[θ]
iv 16.17 His loins will sprout like grass,[ι]
with him[κ] will all nations bless themselves.[κ]
5 [λ]His name shall endure with the sun
and with the moon for ever and ever.

C v 8 May he rule from sea to sea,
from the River to the ends of the earth.
9 Before him foes will bow
and his enemies lick the dust.

(α) 1 By Solomon
(β) 4 He will rule the oppressed of the people, he will save the sons of the needy.[οο]
(γ) 12 He'll deliver the crying needy, the humble and him who is helpless.
13 He'll have pity on the poor and needy, and the lives of the needy he will save.
(δ) 14 that is violence (ε) 15 So that they live and give him of the gold of Sheba.
(ζ) 7 In his days shall righteousness flourish, and welfare thrive till the moon fade.
(η) 16 on the top of the mountains
(θ) 3 The mountains will bear welfare,[ππ] and the hills will run with righteousness.
(ι) 16 of the land (κ) 17 they will call him happy.
(λ) 17 In sunshine his name will bud, his name shall be forever.

(οο) 4 and crush the oppressor (ππ) 3 to the people

vi 10 The kings of The Isles and Tarshish
and [ν]Sheba [ξ]will offer tribute.
11 All kings will bow before him,
all peoples will do him service.

(μ) 10 the kings of (ν) or Seba (ξ) bring a gift

Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text

V. 1.–Five of Kennicott's MSS omit לשלמה, cf. J. B. de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (Parmae, 1788), p. 50. Cheyne, in the article "Psalms", *EB*, 3943-4, considers it an error for "Of Salmah",[39] which he refers to the Salmæans, whom he considers a North Arabian clan forming one of the divisions of the temple singers. It was probably prefixed because of מלכי שבא v. 10. A scribe may have thought of the Queen of Sheba and her visit to King Solomon, cf. 1 Kings 10 1 ff. Briggs considers it a "pseudonym of the author composing from the point of view of Solomon".

אלהים is a redactional change and must be replaced by יהוה. So also Baethgen (1904) and Briggs. For a similar redactional change, cf. Ps. 14 2 and 53 3.

𝔊, 𝔖, and Hier. point to a singular משפטך but 𝔗 הלכת דינך agrees with 𝔐. Baethgen, Wellhausen (*Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, Berlin, 1899, VI, p. 178), Duhm, and Buhl (Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, 1909) read the singular.

On the poetic omission of the article with מלך and בן־מלך, even though definite kings are referred to, cf. Ps. 21 2 and 45 2 and GK, § 126, h. The monosyllables תן and מלך in the phrases למלך־תן and לבן־מלך must be treated as enclitics and closely connected with למלך and לבן, both of which receive the tone because they are emphatic by contrast. Cf. Sievers' *Metrische Studien*,[40] §§ 163, 1 and 263.

[39] Cf. Wellhausen's and Winckler's readings of Cant. 1, 5: קדר ‖ שלמה. Cheyne, in the new edition of his *Book of Psalms* (1904), vol. I, p. xlviii, § 13, suggests also as a preferable emendation "Of Ishmael".

[40] *Abhandlungen der philol-hist. Classe d. Kgl. Sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, vol. 21 (1901).

וצדקתך may take two beats because of its length. Delitzsch and Cheyne (*Origin of the Psalter*, p. 156) consider this a catchword determining the relative position of Pss. 71 and 72, since it occurs both in 71 24 and 72 1. Cheyne (1904) suggests the reading צדקתיך on the basis of Ps. 103 6.

V. 2.–Instead of ידין, 𝔊 undoubtedly read לדין (*κρίνειν*). Buhl prefers to point וְיָדֵן.

For בצדק Briggs would read צדקה. For עמך בצדק, 𝔏 has *populos in tua justitia* (= עמים בְּצִדְקָךְ) and H-P give two variants *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ σου* and *ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου*.

Halévy proposes the reading ועניו for ועניך (*Revue Sémitique*, 1896, p. 333).

If we insert ישפט after ועניך, it gives us the necessary three beats to the hemistich and restores the poetic parallelism. It may have been omitted by haplography (so Briggs, who, however, would put it after במשפט).

V. 4 is a gloss to v. 2. V. 4a is in the same meter as v. 2 (3+3). ישפט in v. 4 is perhaps written with Pesiḳ to call attention to its omission in v. 2. וידכא עושק is a tertiary gloss to v. 4. Duhm, Baethgen (1904), Briggs, Buhl, and Zenner-Wiesmann (*Psalmen*, Münster i/W, 1906-7) also omit it. Cheyne (*EB*, 3954, footnote 4) regards this clause and also יראוך עם־שמש v. 5 as corruptions of "He shall crush the folk of Cusham" (עם כשם). In 1904 he considers ידכא עושק a variant to יראוך עם־שמש v. 5 and emends v. 5 so as to read: "He will crush the folk of Cusham and destroy the race of Jerahmeel" (וישמיד בני ירחמאל). 𝔊 puts all the verbs in v. 4 in the imperative.

V. 3.–This is a prosaic explanatory gloss to v. 16. לעם is a tertiary gloss. We must insert תלכנה before בצדקה. This may be a quotation from some other poem. The person who added this, probably a Palestinian glossator, may have been conscious of the double meaning of בר in פשת־בר v. 16, both "grain" and "purity". Cf. Arabic *barr* "pious, just, righteous, honest" and *burr* "wheat".

For לעם 𝔊 reads *τῷ λαῷ σου* and is followed by 𝔖 and 𝔏. Cheyne (1904) omits it as dittography for לום. For לעם וגבעות בצדקד, Buhl suggests ועלו גבעות צדקה.

According to 𝔊, בצדקה, instead of standing at the end of

v. 3, is put at the beginning of v. 4: *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρινᾶ*. $\mathfrak{G}^{\text{Alb}}$ and $\mathfrak{G}^{\text{Cyr}}$, however, read *καὶ οἱ βουνοί*, with which $\mathfrak{I}$ and Hier. *et colles justitiam* agree. $\mathfrak{S}$ has זדיקותך, as if it had read צדקתך. Houbigant (*Notae Criticae,* Frankfurt a/M, 1777, Tom. II, p. 58) considered the letter ב superfluous. J. B. Köhler in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, XIII (1783), pp. 144-158, thought that ב was either pleonastic, or else we must supply mentally a verb like תבאנה from the preceding. Böttcher in his *Neue exegetisch-kritische Ährenlese* (edited by F. Mühlau, Leipzig, 1864), Part II, p. 266, believing that there was something wanting between גבעות and בצדקה, of which ב was a remnant, supplied תַּצְמַחְנָה. This Hupfeld considered quite superfluous. For בצדקה Graetz read רֹב צדקה, supposing that ר had fallen out of the text before ב. Delitzsch suggested תפרחנה as the missing verb. Wellhausen, Cheyne (1904), Duhm, Briggs and Zenner-Wiesmann read simply צדקה. Briggs considers ב an interpretative gloss. Duhm cancels it as a scribal error caused by the similar expressions in v. 2. Halévy reads בְּרָכָה.

Ehrlich takes שלום to mean "security" as in Zech. 8 10, and considers the preposition in לעם as indicating the genetive-relation, so that שלום לעם would mean "general security". From the latter half of the verse he supplies ב as belonging to ישאו, explains the phrase נשא ב as meaning "to partake of, share in" on the basis of Num. 11 17 and Job 7 13, and renders the verse as follows:

> *dass die Berge der herrschenden Sicherheit teilhaft werden, und die Hügel der Gerechtigkeit.*

V. 4.–For general remarks on v. 4, cf. last paragraph of note on v. 2.

Cheyne (1904) reads עמך for עם. On the poetic omission of the article with עם, cf. Ps. 22 7 and 45 13.

הושיע may be construed either with the accusative, as in Ps. 6 5, or with the dative (ל), as here and in Ps. 116 6. According to Duhm, the construction with the dative is an indication of late date.

V. 5.–The emendation וַיַּאֲרִיךְ on the basis of $\mathfrak{G}$ *συμπαραμενεῖ*, and $\mathfrak{I}$ *permanebit* for $\mathfrak{M}$ יראוך was first suggested by Job

Ludolf in his edition of the Ethiopic Psalter in 1721 and has since been adopted by Houbigant, Lagarde, Bickell, Brüll (*Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte u. Litteratur*, 1885, p. 71), Cheyne (*Book of Psalms*, London, 1888), Nowack (Hupfeld-Nowack, *Die Psalmen,* 3rd ed., Gotha, 1888), Kautzsch (*Beilagen,* Freiburg i/B, 1896), Oort, Buhl, Baethgen, and Ehrlich. Most scholars construe this verb without an object in the sense of "to live long" and cite Eccles. 7 15. Hupfeld, Graetz, Wellhausen, and Halévy read יִרָאוּהוּ.

Cheyne (1904) considers דור דורים: ירד "a careless scribe's three attempts to write יוריד".

Ewald thinks a verse has fallen out between vv. 4 and 5, cf. *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft,* V (1853), p. 173. Beer (*Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen,* Marburg 1894, p. 59 f.) considers v. 5 a marginal gloss that has crept into the text. Baethgen regards it as a later insertion, breaking the connection between vv. 4 and 6. Duhm pronounces vv. 5-11 not genuine and as disturbing the connection between vv. 1-4 and v. 12 ff.

In view of שמו in v. 17, the first part of which verse is a gloss to v. 5, we must insert שמו, which has been omitted before עם־שמש, perhaps by haplography. We should read ועם ירח, instead of לפני ירח, as the latter may be due to לפני שמש in v. 17. The first and second clauses of v. 17 should be transposed, and the second clause, לפני־שמש ינין שמו, regarded as an incorrect poetic explanatory gloss to v. 5, and the first clause as a correct prosaic gloss to the same verse.

In the phrases עם־שמש and ועם־ירח in v. 5, על־גז v. 6, עד־בלי v. 7, עד־ים v. 8, על־דל v. 13, and כי־יציל v. 12, the monosyllabic prepositions עד, על, and עם and the conjunction כי are proclitic and throw the tone on the following word, cf. Sievers, §§ 144-5 and 149, 2.

v. 6.–α' renders על־גז by *ἐπὶ κουράν.* $\mathfrak{G}$ σ' and the other Greek versions give *ἐπὶ πόκον*, with which $\mathfrak{S}$ על גזתא, $\mathfrak{L}$ *in vellus*, and Hier. *super vellus* agree. Graetz proposed the emendation גַּז. Cheyne (1904) emends כמטר על־גז to *Maacath and Amalek* (!).

On the authority of $\mathfrak{G}^{\text{Cpl}}$ and $\mathfrak{G}^{\text{Alb}}$ *ὡσεὶ σταγὼν ἡ στάζουσα* and $\mathfrak{S}^{\text{ph}}$ ואיך טופתא אידא דנטפא, we may change the traditional division of the consonantal text, as at the time the text of our

psalm was written there was *scriptio continua* and no *matres lectionis*, join the final ם of 𝔐 כרביים with the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον זרזיף, point it as מְזָרֵף, and read the sg. כרביב. Cf. Prof. Haupt's paper "Lea und Rahel", *ZAT*, 29, 286, n. 5, where the participle מזרף is referred to a stem זרף, which is identified with the stem זלף and is found also in the Syriac *zârîftâ*, "shower of rain". The word מזרף, because followed by ארץ, has recessive accent and should be accented on the penult, cf. GK, § 29, e, and Sievers, §§ 169-176, particularly § 174, 1 and 2.

Baethgen, who retains 𝔐 זרזיף as a noun in the sense of "shower" or "sprinkling", gives examples of similar quadriliteral, or pluriconsonantal, forms in ancient and modern Syriac with the repetition of the first radical in the third place.

Wellhausen thinks a verb is concealed in 𝔐 זרזיף. Hupfeld proposed the emendation יזריף, which was adopted by Bickell and Cheyne (1888). Graetz, following Krochmal, read ירעיפו (*befruchten*). Halévy suggests יְרַוּוּ "saturates, waters", and Duhm proposes the reading זִרְזְפוּ. So also Buhl, who gives also alternative readings זרפי and ירזיף, and compares Syr. זרף to Heb. זרם. Briggs reads זרפי and regards the י in זרזיף as transposed. Cheyne (1904) emends the second clause to *Rehobothites and Zarephathites*. Ehrlich retains 𝔐 and considers זרזיף a predicate noun and ארץ in the accusative depending upon the idea of motion expressed in זרזיף.

V. 7.–With the majority of modern commentators, including Hare, Street, Lagarde, Oort, Graetz, Krochmal, Wellhausen, Duhm, Baethgen, Cheyne (1904), Ehrlich and Buhl, we must read צדק for 𝔐 צדיק, on the authority of the ancient versions 𝔊, 𝔗, Hier., and 𝔖 and three MSS. Briggs suggests either צדק or צדקה with a preference for the latter, as in v. 2 it is also שלום.

Cheyne (1904) emends בימיו to באדמה.

Hitzig considered ורב שלום a corruption of דְּבֶר שלום which, together with v. 8, he regarded as a quotation from Zech. 9 10. Halévy thinks the second hemistich of v. 7 is corrupt and reads יְרֵב for ורב, an emendation also suggested by Lagarde. Cheyne (1904) considers vv. 7b and 8 glosses to v. 6 and emends 7b to וירד ישמעאל וירחמאל and v. 8 to וירד ישמעאל וירחמאל וג׳. Ehr-

lich reads וְרַב and עַד for 𝔐 עד and renders *Und volle Sicherheit herrsche auch in mondloser Nacht.* Briggs omits ורב as an interpretative gloss to שלום. Buhl suggests וְרַב or וְיֶרֶב. The former emendation is to be preferred.

For ירח Buhl would read חק as in Isa. 5 14.

This verse is an explanatory gloss to v. 6. The monosyllable וְרַב is proclitic, because of its close connection with שלום, and gives it the tone, cf. Sievers, § 162, 1 b.

V. 8.–Giesebrecht, Baethgen, Beer and also Duhm consider vv. 8-11 a later insertion. Briggs adds also v. 12 and v. 17b. According to Duhm and Baethgen, v. 8 is taken almost word for word from Zech. 9 10. Duhm considers 𝔐 וְיֶרֶד a scribal error caused by יֶרֶד at the beginning of v. 6, and substitutes וּמָשַׁל from Zech. 9 10.

𝔖 נהרותא and 𝔈 *'aflâg* "rivers" may be *plurales amplificativi* for *the great river,* the Euphrates, cf. *Crit. Notes on Prov.* (*SBOT*), p. 34, l. 31, and *Crit. Notes on Kings* (*SBOT*), p. 295, l. 3.

In the phrase עַד־אפסי ארץ, because of the proclitic preposition עַד (cf. Sievers, § 145), we should expect the tone to rest on the final syllable of אפסי. But then we should have two accented syllables following each other, as אפסי אָרֶץ. According to GK, § 29, e, the tone could not rest on the first syllable of אפסי, because it is closed, but we know from GK, § 29, g, that our rule is not without its exceptions. On the question of the recession of the accent, cf. also Sievers, §§ 169-176, particularly § 174, 1 and 2. Sievers suggests in § 175 changing the accent of the second word, in this case ארץ to אֶרֶץ, but this is impossible as ארץ is a monosyllable (cf. GK, § 84, a). It is only fair, however, to Professor Sievers to state that he considers the segholates dissyllabic,[41] cf. *Metrische Studien,* § 193, 6.

V. 9.–𝔖 גזרתא points to a reading איים for 𝔐 ציים. Cheyne (1904) reads מִצָּרִים and for 𝔐 ואויבו, וערבים. Olshausen's emendation צרים restores the parallelism and is to be preferred. This has been adopted by Graetz, Hupfeld, Halevy, Dyserinck, Bickell, Cheyne (1888), Oort, Siegfried-Stade, Wellhausen,

[41] They are dissyllabic in certain modern Arabic dialects, cf. *kelleb* or *kalb.*

Duhm, and Briggs. Because of the preceding לפניו, it is not necessary with Buhl to read צריו.

V. 10.–Cheyne (*EB*, 4899, article "Tarshish") emends *Tarshish* to *'Ašḥûr* or *'Aššûr* and defines it as "a N. Arabian district of somewhat uncertain extent, also known perhaps as Geshur". In 1904 he reads *Jerahmeelites and Asshurites* for מלכי תרשיש ואיים and omits *Jerahmeelites* as an incorrect variant to *and Asshurites*.

Bickell and Cheyne regard סבא as a later insertion, cf. *EB*, 4342, article "Seba", and Cheyne (1904), where he reads שבאים.

Hitzig considered אשכר a corruption of אשפר, which occurs in 2 Sam. 6 19 and 1 Ch. 16 3. The meaning of אשפר, however, is doubtful. For אשכר, Cheyne (1904) reads אַשְׁחֵר חָרִין, considers it a gloss on תרשיש, and omits מלכי v. 10b as dittography.

We must omit מנחה ישיבו as a prosaic explanatory gloss to אשכר יקריבו v. 11, as well as מלכי before שבא and also וסבא as glosses.

V. 11.–Instead of כל־מלכים, 𝔏 read *omnes reges terrae*, with which $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathfrak{Cpl}}$ and $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathfrak{Alb}}$ agree.–Cheyne (1904) regards v. 11 as a gloss to v. 10b.

The monosyllabic pronominal forms לו and בו in the phrases וישתחוו־לו v. 11, עזר־לו v. 12, ויתן־לו or ויתנו־לו v. 15, and ויתברכו־בו v. 17b are enclitic and throw the tone on the preceding syllable, cf. Sievers, § 165.

V. 12.–Beer (*op. cit.*, p. 59 f.), following Giesebrecht and Baethgen, thinks this verse is most naturally connected with v. 7.

$\mathfrak{G}$, Hier., 𝔖 read משוע for $\mathfrak{M}$ משׁע. So also Ehrlich, in the sense of "magnate". Cheyne (1904) reads מְעוּשָׁק.

This and v. 13 are to be omitted as mere repetitions of the thought of v. 14. Briggs omits v. 12 as a gloss and a mere variation of v. 4. Vv. 12-13 may be illustrative quotations from some other poem, added by a later hand.

V. 14.–Duhm considers מתוך and ומחמם variants and omits the latter (so also Buhl). Cheyne (1904) thinks that מתוך probably represents *Maacath* and חמם is a corrupt form of *Cusham*, which is a gloss to *Maacath*. We must, however, point מתך

(from stem תכך, cf. Syr. *tûkâ*) with Hitzig and Duhm.[42] ומחמם is an explanatory gloss to the more unusual word מתוך, with *Waw explicativum,* which frequently accompanies glosses (so also Baethgen and Briggs).

Instead of וייקר, we should point וְיֵיקַר with Olshausen and compare 2 Kings 1 13. α' *καὶ τιμηθήσεται* seems to point to a reading וְיֻיַקַּר.

For דמם, $\mathfrak{G}\theta'\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{Z}$ read שמם. $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathfrak{Cpl}}$ and $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathfrak{Ald}}$ have *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.*

V. 15.–Cheyne (1888) considers this verse a quotation from an intercessory prayer for the king, which was written by one scribe in the margin and incorporated into the text by another. Baethgen adopts this view for the first clause only and in his third edition (1904) finds a confirmation of his view in the different meter (*Vierer* = tetrameter, i. e., 2 + 2 beats) in this clause from that of the rest of the verse (*Doppeldreier* = double trimeter, i. e., 3 + 3 beats). Buhl omits this clause as a later addition and Beer as a marginal gloss incorporated in the text. Duhm finds in it two distinct glosses, the first of which, ויחי, he thinks is taken from Ps. 49 10 (Heb.) and refers to the poor man, while the second has the king or the Messiah as its subject. Briggs inserts the words המלך לעולם after ויחי: "It is probable that an ancient copyist used ויחי for the longer formula, and that a later scribe misunderstood his abbreviation".

Cheyne (1904) considers ויחי a variant to יהי v. 16, and "they give him of the gold of Sheba" a paraphrase of v. 10b. For ויתפלל בעדו תמיד, he reads ויפליט עבדיו מאדום and for כל־היום יברכנהו, מִירחמאלים יפרקנו.

Ehrlich reads for ויחי the Pi'el וִיחַי "may he live!" and compares German *leben lassen* and Arabic *ḥayya*, II *ḥayyâ* "to greet, salute". He considers the subject of this verb as well as the suffix in לו and the subjects of the verbs יתפלל and יברכנהו as indefinite.–Graetz puts all the verbs in this verse in the plural and emends לו to למו.

Max L. Strack in his *Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (Berlin, 1897),

[42] On a similar use of תוך for תך, cf. 2 Sam. 1 25a and Professor Haupt's paper "David's Dirge on Saul and Jonathan", *JHUC,* No. 163, p. 57a, n. 27.

pp. 12-17, considers כל־הגוים יברכנהו as an explanatory gloss, added by an orthodox Jew to prevent the preceding clause from being taken to mean divine worship of the king.

We must omit the first part of v. 15 as an explanatory gloss, appended to v. 14 by some reader, in the same style as ויבא עושק v. 4.–For the sgs. יתפלל and יברכנהו, we should in each case read the plural.

V. 16.–For 𝔐 יהי we should read יהיה.–For the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον פסת, Lagarde, Graetz, Cheyne and Wellhausen propose שִׂפְעַת "fullness". Hupfeld cites this emendation with approval, cf. Hupfeld-Nowack *Die Psalmen* (3rd ed., Gotha, 1888), p. 205. Duhm's conjecture of מִסַּת "sufficiency" on the basis of the Syriac מסתא "contentment" (1 Tim. 6 6) is unsatisfactory. Cheyne (1904) reads משפט. פסת has been referred to the stems פשה (Arabic *fašā*, Mishnic פסה) and פסס *to spread out* but it is probably phonetic reading for פִּשַּׁת from a stem נפש, akin to Assyrian *napâšu* "to be abundant", Aram. נפַשׁ "to be numerous", and Arabic *nafise* "great riches". Cf. Peshitta סוגלא דעבורא = Assyr. *napâš ebûri* "abundance of grain" and the footnote by Professor Haupt in *BA*, 5, 471 f. The form פִּשֶּׁת, then, which we should perhaps read instead of פִּשַּׁת, may be referred to this verb, or, as verbs Primae Nun and Primae Waw frequently interchange, to a stem *napâšu* (for *uapâšu*). פִּשֶּׁת, then, would be formed from a biconsonantal theme פש, just as Heb. שְׁנָה, which is usually referred to ישן (for ושן), and Syriac שנתא with the same meaning, cf. Nöld., Syr. Gr., § 105. If we retain the pointing פִּשַּׁת, we may compare with it the analogical post-Biblical word טִפָּה "drop" from נטף.–The words בר and שמש in פשת־בר and לפני־שמש v. 17a receive the tone after their constructs, which are regularly proclitic, cf. Sievers, §§ 158 and 159, 2. Cheyne (1904) considers 𝔐 בר miswritten for בארץ and reads יחי for 𝔐 יהי. בראש הרים must be omitted as a gloss by a Palestinian reader, as there are no mountains in Egypt. For בראש Cheyne (1904) reads כְּבָרוֹשׁ.

Ewald, assuming a hypothetical stem ראש (*gipfeln*) as identical with רעש, emended 𝔐 ירעש to יראש, cf. *Jahrbücher d. Bib. Wissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1853) 5, 173. Graetz proposed the emendation יֵעָשֵׁר "may it be rich (or abundant)". Duhm reads

דֵּי עשב לפניו for 𝔐 ירעש כלבנון and translates די עשב by *Kraut genug.* On the basis of Job 5 25 and 21 8, he joins לפניו with 𝔐 ויציצו מעיר, which he emends to צֶאֱצָאֵי מֵעָיו, places 𝔐 פריו after מעיו, and renders the whole: *Vor ihm* (dem Könige) *seien die Sprösslinge seines Leibes, seine* (Leibes-)*Frucht.*–For 𝔐 ירעש, Cheyne (1904) reads יִשְׁרַשׁ "it will strike root". Buhl thinks ירעש corrupt and would put the Sôph Pāsûḳ immediately after it.

For 𝔐 פריו, Wellhausen reads פרי as a genetive depending on לבנון and renders it *a Lebanon of fruit* "a hyperbolical plural of *fruit-tree* = a vast number of fruit-trees". Baethgen (*Die Psalmen*[2], 1897) emends it to יפרו "may they be fruitful", connects it closely with what follows, and thinks that יפרו was perhaps originally a gloss to 𝔐 ויציצו. In his third edition (1904), he gives up the idea that יפרו was a gloss. For 𝔐 כלבנון פריו, Cheyne (1904) reads כְּאֶרֶז בַּלְּבָנוֹן, supposing that כארז has fallen out, owing to the resemblance of ארז to ירעש.

For 𝔐 ויציצו מעיר, Graetz proposed the emendation ויציצו ערים. For 𝔐 ויציצו מעיר כעשב הארץ, Cheyne (1904) reads ויציץ כעשב הארץ, omitting מעיר as a corruption of וערים, which he considers a variant to הרים. For 𝔐 ויציצו, Ehrlich reads וְיֵצְאוּ.–𝔐 מעיר is probably haplography for מֵעָיו. We may omit הארץ as a gloss.

Briggs (*Psalms*, 1907) omits בר as an explanatory gloss, reads שֶׂה for ירעש, regarding it as probably representing יִרְעֶה־שֶׂה "may sheep pasture", of which ירע then would be an explanatory gloss to שה, and renders the first part of the verse: *May there be an aftergrowth in the land, on the top of the mountains sheep.* For 𝔐 כלבנון פריו he reads בלבנון פרים *kine on Lebanon,* basing his emendations on 𝔊 ὑπέρ = ב and that ו is "often error for מ". מעיר he changes to מִנְעָר and renders the last clause of the verse: *And may flowers bloom out of the forests as herbs of the field.*

Baethgen (1904), for metrical reasons, thinks a foot is lacking after הארץ at the close of the verse and that we must supply some word like יפרח or יצמח (*sprosst*).

V. 17.–For remarks on the first two clauses of v. 17, cf. first paragraph of note on v. 5.

The last clause of v. 17, with the insertion of the article before גוים and the omission of יַאַשְׁרֻהוּ as an explanatory gloss to the preceding, should be put after the last clause of v. 16 to form the first line of the second couplet (vv. 17 and 5) of the second stanza (vv. 6, 16, 17, 5) of the poem.

Cheyne (1904) omits 𝔐 שמש and considers it a distortion of שמו, written too soon. For לפני, he reads לפניך, emends ינין to יִכּוֹן (so also Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Graetz, Ehrlich, and Briggs on the authority of 𝔊, 𝔍, 𝔗 and one Heb. MS), and renders: *Before Thee let his name endure.* Duhm thinks we have a conflate reading in 𝔐 יהי שמו לעולם, for which 𝔊 shows the original text. He accordingly substitutes ברוך for שמו (Buhl ברוך for יהי) and considers 𝔐 ינין a mistake for יניץ from a stem נוץ = נצץ. Cheyne (1904) considers this latter emendation "an improbable Aramaism". Buhl in Gesenius-Buhl's *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterbuch* (15th ed., 1910), s. v. נין, infers from 𝔊 διαμενεῖ the reading יָדוּן "remain" from דון on the basis of Gen. 6 3. Nestle conjectures a form from לון or לין, see *ZAT*, 25, 201.

For the second שמו, which Briggs omits as a copyist's error, Ehrlich conjectures שִׁמְשׁוֹ and interprets it as meaning "his lucky star", comparing Jer. 15 9 and Ḳiddushin 72b: עד שלא כבתה שמשו של עלי זרחה שמשו של שמואל "before Eli's star was extinguished, Samuel's star rose".

Beer considers the whole of v. 17a a marginal gloss, incorporated into the text, and Briggs v. 17b a gloss based on Gen. 12 3 18 18 and 22 18.

On the authority of 𝔊, Kautzsch, Cheyne (1888), G. Buchanan Gray (*JQR*, 7, 679, n. 2), Duhm, Briggs and Buhl supply כל־משפחות הארץ, the latter putting it after יַאַשְׁרֻהוּ, Graetz כל עמי הארץ, and Wellhausen, Baethgen and Ehrlich כל־משפחות האדמה. Cheyne (1904) supplies simply משפחות.

With Wellhausen we may omit יַאַשְׁרֻהוּ as a gloss to the preceding יתברכו־בו.

V. 18.–Verses 18 and 19, which form the doxology and are no part of the original poem, have no metrical form as they stand. In order to give them a regular meter, we should have

to omit יהוה אלהים v. 18a, שם 19a, and כבודו 19b. Zenner-Wiesmann omit vv. 18-20.

𝔐 אלהים is omitted by five MSS, 𝔊 and 𝔖. Briggs considers it a "conflation of Elohistic and Yahwistic editors".

V. 19.–It is perhaps better with Duhm, GK, § 121, e, and Cheyne (1904), following 𝔊 Num. 14 21 to read Kal ימלא instead of Niph'al.

V. 20.–The colophon is wanting in seven MSS. On the form כָּלוּ, Pu'al with *ŏ* for *ŭ*, cf. GK, § 52, q.

It is not necessary with Graetz, T. K. Abbott in *Hermathena* VIII (1893), p. 76, Cheyne (1904) and Ehrlich to read תהלות for 𝔐 תפלות.

According to Cheyne (1904) 𝔐 דוד בן־ישי has come from *Arab-Ethan the sons of Ishmael.* He considers 𝔐 בן־ישי a corruption of בני ישמעאל, which he makes a gloss or variant on ערב איתן, derived from 𝔐 דוד. In his opinion, the colophon, which originally referred to what he terms the "Ethanic Psalter", a collection of the earlier psalms entitled "Of Arab-Ethan", was transferred to the end of Ps. 72 to include it also, although it was originally entitled "Of Ishmael", and later on the words, "the sons of Ishmael", were appended to "Arab-ethan".

B. Jacob, in an article entitled "Die Reihenfolge der Psalmen", *ZAT,* 18, 100, n. 1, maintains that 𝔐 תפלות דוד should be translated *Ended are prayers of David* (i. e., there now follows a series of others), not *the prayers of David,* but, as Nöldeke has shown in *ZAT,* 18, 256, it can only be rendered *the prayers of David,* as the construct is made definite by the following proper noun. *Prayers of David* would have to be expressed by תפלות לדוד, cf. *a son of Jesse* בן לִישׁי, GK, § 129, c.